REMARKS

Election of Inventions

The Examiner has required an election of a single species for the prosecution on the merits. The Examiner has identified the following inventions:

Invention I: claims 1-38, drawn to a printing medium;

Invention II: claims 39-51, drawn to a method of making; and

Invention III: claim 52, drawn to a business method.

The Examiner indicates that the inventions are distinct. APPLICANT HEREBY ELECTS INVENTION I, CLAIMS 1-38, with traverse.

The Restriction Requirement set forth in the Office Action is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons. In the Restriction Requirement, the Examiner has indicated that Inventions I and II are related as a process of making and the product made. The Examiner concludes that in the instant case, the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process, (i.e. providing a substrate, printing a non-porous image layer on the substrate, and laminating a thin ink receptive film on the image layer).

In response to the Examiner's conclusions, it is the Applicant's position that the apparatus claims, 1-38, should be examinable together, with the method claims, 39-51. The "materially different process" described by the Examiner is identical to that which is claimed in independent claim 38. More specifically, laminating a thin ink receptive film on the image layer, as suggested by the Examiner as part of the materially different process, is the same as applying an ink receptive layer on the image layer limitation found in claim 38. Therefore, Inventions I and II are not distinct, and withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement is requested.

Based on the foregoing, reconsideration of the Restriction Requirement is respectfully requested, and Applicant's representative would be happy to discuss any issues in this regard with the Examiner which may remain.

Respectfully submitted,

HAHN LOESER & PARKS, LLP

By

Keith J. Marcinowski

Reg. No. 56,110 Tel.: (330) 864-5550

Fax: (330) 864-7986